	N3u2Bai	nC kjc		
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
2	X			
3	UNITED	STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.	
4		V.	S5 22 Cr. 673 (LAK)	
5	SAMUEL BANKMAN-FRIED,			
6	Defendant.			
7		x	Arraignment	
8			March 30, 2023 11:00 a.m.	
9	Before:			
10	HON. LEWIS A. KAPLAN,			
11			District Judge	
12				
13		APPEARANCES		
14	DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the			
15	BY: N	outhern District of New York ICOLAS T. ROOS		
16 17	Di Al	ANIELLE M. KUDLA ANIELLE R. SASSOON NDREW A. ROHRBACH		
18	A:	Assistant United States Attorneys		
19	At	MERRICK GARLAND Attorney General of the United States Department of Justice		
20	BY: JIL SIMON Trial Attorney			
21		COHEN & GRESSER, LLP		
22	At	Attorneys for Defendant MARK S. COHEN		
23		HRISTIAN R. EVERDELL		
24				
25	Also Pa	resent: Joseph Lupinacci, FBI		

1	(Case called)		
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Government, are you ready?		
3	MR. ROOS: Yes. Good morning, your Honor. Nicolas		
4	Roos, Daniel Kudla, Jil Simon, Danielle Sassoon, Andrew		
5	Rohrbach for the United States. We are joined by Joe Lupinacci		
6	from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.		
7	THE COURT: Good morning.		
8	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Defendant, are you ready?		
9	MR. COHEN: Yes, your Honor. Good morning. Mark		
10	Cohen, Cohen & Gresser, for the defendant, Mr. Bankman-Fried.		
11	MR. EVERDELL: Good morning, your Honor. Christian		
12	Everdell, Cohen & Gresser, for the defendant.		
13	THE COURT: Good morning. And Mr. Everdell, I just		
14	want you to know that the scheduling I had no flexibility on.		
15	It just had to be.		
16	MR. EVERDELL: I understand, your Honor.		
17	THE COURT: Okay.		
18	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Should I arraign the defendant?		
19	THE COURT: Yes, on both outstanding ones.		
20	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Mr. Cohen, have you received		
21	copies of the S3 and S5 indictments in this case?		
22	MR. COHEN: Yes, we have.		
23	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Have you reviewed both the S3 and		
24	S5 indictments with your client?		
25	MR. COHEN: Yes, we have.		

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Does your client waive the public readings as to each of the S3 and S5 indictment?

MR. COHEN: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: And how does your client plead to each of them?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  COHEN: My client pleads not guilty to each of the S3 and S5 indictments.

Your Honor, for record purposes, we wish to note by pleading not guilty my client is not acknowledging that he can be tried on the new counts that were brought after his extradition, and that will be the subject of one of our motions to your Honor but, namely, it will be the new counts brought in S3 and S5—Count Four for commodities fraud; Six for securities fraud; Nine for conspiracy to commit bank fraud; Ten, conspiracy to operate an unlicensed money transmitting business; and Thirteen brought this week for conspiracy to violate the FCPA.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Roos, I think it is you folks who wanted a conference.

MR. ROOS: So, your Honor, in addition to arraigning the defendant and excluding time, which I will ask for at the end, I think the other reasons we wrote to you were, number one, on the bail issues. Your Honor has now entered the bail order, perhaps mooting that point.

The other thing is the discovery. Last time we had somewhat of a lengthy colloquy giving your Honor an update. That was on March 10. We have made productions. We are about to make another one. I think it may — some things have changed since the last time. I think it may be appropriate just, if the Court is interested, to give you an update so you —

THE COURT: Yes, sure.

MR. ROOS: -- sort of know where we are.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROOS: Is it okay if I go over to the lectern?

THE COURT: Yes, sure.

MR. ROOS: Thank you.

So like I said, when we last appeared on March 10, we had produced approximately -- I think I put it in the range of 2 million pages of documents. Since then, we made another production on March 17, which was about 1.1 million pages, plus producing the defendant's Google accounts, which was about 2.5 million pages, putting the total document production around 6 million pages, plus some additional data that has not been stamped because it's the full image for a device.

THE COURT: Run that last part, it was the full?

MR. ROOS: It's the full -- it's like the entirety of a cell phone image or of a computer image, and therefore each file doesn't have a stamp. It's just like the device image

has a stamp.

So at this point the defendant has legal process, that is, the warrants, affidavits, applications, and orders; he has the F.B.I. records relating to the execution of the warrants and the seizures; and he has the material seized from his own devices.

I will also just note for the record that we have received the discovery and particulars request, a letter request from the defense, which we have responded to.

So sort of giving that to your Honor at the outset to say I think, for purposes of motion practice, the defendant has the indictment, he has the materials for a suppression motion, he has the materials for any sort of discovery or bill of particulars motion. So I think defense counsel was going to raise a slight adjustment to the motion schedule which we are fine with, but I think the high-level point that I wanted to make to your Honor is I think, broadly speaking, we are on track to meet the motion deadline that we have in place or a slight modification of it.

So that brings me to what's left. Last time we talked about, I will say, three buckets—the devices, the very large Google search warrant return, and then the final two buckets were sort of the voluntary and subpoena production, some third-parties, and some other grab bag items. So I was just going to give your Honor a brief update on where we are

on those things, a little bit of bad news and then some good news. I will start with the bad news.

So last time we told the Court that there are seven devices that are in the government's possession—two were obtained pursuant to warrant, five were obtained on consent—all subject to privilege review. As of the last conference, two of them had been produced and there were five remaining. Your Honor sort of identified them as devices A, B, C, D, and E on the record just so we could talk about them, the first three being A, B, and C which were all laptops on consent and then D and E being the two seized devices. So I am just going to use the same nomenclature today as I am giving you an update on the devices.

THE COURT: D and E were the consent?

MR. ROOS: Were the seized. A, B, and C were the consent; D and E were the seized.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROOS: So on A, B, and C -- so A and C are two laptops. They were both received on consent. They needed to go through a privilege review. That privilege review is done for one of them and is effectively done for the other, and so at this point all that needs to happen is the production of the device without those privilege -- tagged privilege materials to the defense. So I think at the last conference I told your Honor I thought we would be able to hit an end of

March deadline. It may drag a teeny bit into April, but those devices are done.

The other consent, which we were calling laptop B, this is the bit of bad news. So this is a -- it's a really large device and, because of the size, there have been a lot of sort of technical issues with the extracting device and then also being able to do a privilege review of it. We are still trying to work through how to -- how to do the privilege review and also how to get a copy to the defense that doesn't have the privileged materials.

So our current plan is there is, let's say, a large portion of the device that does not hit on privilege terms, and so we are going to extract that out and put it on a separate drive for the defense, and then try to deal with the remainder. The device is so large that recently when we have tried to have a filter AUSA review the Slack messages on it, we couldn't even load them up to do the privilege review. So we are basically going to have to take -- sort of virtually take the device apart, as I understand it, and work through it.

So the bad news is that is not going to be done by the end of March. I think we are going to continue to try to devote a lot of resources to making this happen and hopefully we will achieve it soon. I am reluctant to give an exact date on it because this particular device has taken in some places

weeks in order to even just extract off, and so I wish I could say this will be — this leg will copy off the device in this amount of time, but I'm not that technically savvy. They won't even let me in the F.B.I. lab. So I can't make any assurances. But we are certainly hoping in the next few weeks or within the next month that will be produced. I will say it is a device on consent, so I don't think it should be particularly relevant for motion practice, and the government isn't getting like an advantage on this. We are not looking at it either.

The two other devices, which are the two warrant devices, so device D was the laptop. That has finished its privilege review. We had finished a responsiveness review, but then it looked like there were some items missing that basically didn't come out of the extraction, so we are in the process of going back and looking to see if there are additional materials that need to be produced off that. And the last item, E, is the cell phone which was obtained through the warrant. We just finished our review, and so we should be getting the responsive materials out in this next production.

THE COURT: Which will be approximately when?

MR. ROOS: It could be tomorrow, it could be the beginning of next week.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROOS: So the second big category is Google.

This is, I would say, where there is, on balance, good news. When we last spoke on March 10, the Google returns were still being loaded, so there had been no privilege review at that point. At this point all of the privilege screening is done. The defendant has been produced the entirety of the full accounts that belong to him.

The responsiveness review has begun. There are 2.69 million nonprivileged e-mails and documents. At this point we are through -- we have tagged responsive or not responsive 1.53 million, so it leaves a balance of about a million, but I would say we are sort of making good headway and working through this efficiently, and the F.B.I. has devoted a tremendous amount of resources to this. So I think we are on pace to achieve the deadlines we spoke of previously.

The last category --

THE COURT: Remind me of what that was.

MR. ROOS: April.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROOS: And the last category is the sort of subpoena returns, voluntary productions, publicly available information. So we made a fairly substantial production about a week after our last conference. At this point we have obtained 1.03 million documents, so 1,037,000 documents from third parties by subpoena or voluntary production. We have produced 927,000, so that leaves, quick math, maybe 110,000,

give or take, to be produced.

THE COURT: Bedtime reading.

MR. ROOS: What's that?

THE COURT: Bedtime reading.

MR. ROOS: Bedtime reading. But in the scheme of things, less than 10 percent. So those will be pushed out in the next production or two.

THE COURT: All right. It doesn't sound too terrible.

Mr. Cohen, you are going to tell me why it is terrible.

MR. COHEN: Your Honor, briefly, we don't have an application today about the trial date in light of Mr. Roos's statement to the Court. We just want to note that we do have a concern about laptop B that he just described because, as we understand that, that relates to a cooperating witness who will be an important government witness at trial, and I don't think there is anything to do about it today, but if this continues we may have to come back to your Honor on that. So I would urge the government team to really devote resources to getting us laptop B.

And the only other thing we have from the defense today, your Honor, as Mr. Roos bookmarked, we would request that the motion schedule be shifted by one week in light of the new charges brought in the S3 and S5. Our motions are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

currently due May 1, and this would have them be May 8; the government's response is currently due May 22, and this would move it to May 29; and our reply is currently due June 5, and this would move it to June 12.

THE COURT: Okay. You've got it.

MR. COHEN: Thank you. That's all we have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Andy, we need to see whether we can set an argument or conference date.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Sure, Judge.

(Court and deputy confer)

THE COURT: We will set argument or conference for June 15. Since I have a trial that day, being a Thursday, we will let the jury out early if we are still in trial, so let's say 3:30. Does that work for everybody?

MR. ROOS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. COHEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. ROOS: Two other things. Your Honor entered the bail order. At that point --

THE COURT: I do appreciate all the hard work that went into it  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$ 

MR. ROOS: Thank you, your Honor. Well --

THE COURT: -- on both sides.

MR. ROOS: -- I think it's fairly straightforward.

Your Honor signed it. But we are, of course, happy to answer any questions. I think the bail order said on it the S3 indictment. I think maybe it is just — it is appropriate to, to the extent — to avoid any ambiguity, to confirm that the current bail order extends to the now S5 indictment.

THE COURT: All right. The current bail order extends to the S5 indictment.

MR. ROOS: Thank you, your Honor.

The only other thing I would do --

THE COURT: There's a careful fellow.

MR. ROOS: -- would be to make a motion to exclude time, unless there is anything else from defense counsel.

THE COURT: Well, it is excluded already, isn't it, until the trial date?

MR. ROOS: It is excluded, I think, on the original indictment.

MR. COHEN: We have no objection, your Honor.

MR. ROOS: So I would make the application to exclude time in the S5 indictment for the reasons stated on the record on January 3, which were principally so the government can produce discovery, the defense can review discovery, engage in motion practice, and prepare for trial.

THE COURT: Granted. Time is excluded until October 2 on all the indictments.

MR. ROOS: Thank you, your Honor.

```
N3u2BanC kjc
                THE COURT: Okay. If there is nothing else? Okay.
 1
 2
      Thank you.
 3
                                       000
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```